PROPERTY OF THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MAR 2 1931
North Carolina College
FOR WOMEN

Social Conditions In Soviet Russia

discussed by

WILLIAM C. WHITE
MAURICE HINDUS
MARJORIE SHULER

January 31, 1931

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION
Incorporated
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
Eighteen East Forty-first Street
New York

New York Luncheon Discussion

Pamphlet No. 72
Series 1930-31
March, 1931
15c. a copy

SPEAKERS' TABLE

ISAAC DON LEVINE—*Formerly newspaper correspondent in Russia for three years*

MRS. ROSA LADDON HANNA—*Representative of The Open Road in Russia for th last two and a half years*

REV. CAMERON PARKER HALL—*Minister, Christ Presbyterian Church, New York in Russia in 1930*

OSCAR R. EWING—*Lawyer, of Hughes, Schurman & Dwight*

LOUIS CONNICK—*Lawyer, of Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett; in Russia in 1929*

RICHARD B. SCANDRETT, JR.—*Lawyer, of Willcox, Swiger, Chambers & Scandrett in Russia in 1929*

DR. ALZADA COMSTOCK—*Professor of Economics and Sociology, Mount Holyoke College; author of various magazine articles on Russia; in Russia in 1930*

CHARLES SHIPMAN PAYSON—*Member of the Board, Suchar Process Corporation*

SAMUEL R. BERTRON— *President, Bertron, Griscom & Co.; chairman of the Board of Directors, American-Russian Chamber of Commerce*

MISS LILLIAN D. WALD—*Founder and Head Resident, Henry Street Settlement; member F. P. A. Board of Directors*

NICHOLAS RAFFALOVICH—*European representative of Field, Glore & Company*

FELIX M. WARBURG—*Banker, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; chairman, American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee*

MR. HINDUS—*Author, "Humanity Uprooted," "Broken Earth," etc.*

MR. McDONALD—*Chairman*

MISS SHULER—*Special correspondent for The Christian Science Monitor*

MR. WHITE—*Author, "These Russians"*

DR. DEXTER PERKINS—*Head of the Department of History, University of Rochester; secretary, American Historical Association; chairman, F. P. A. Rochester Branch*

MRS. VICTOR FRANKLIN BLAKESLEE—*Formerly Countess Irina Wladimirovna Kelly (neé Skariatina), of Russia*

SAM A. LEWISOHN—*Banker, of Adolph Lewisohn & Sons; author, "The New Leadership in Industry," etc.*

WALTER H. POLLAK—*Lawyer, member of the firm of Engelhard, Pollak, Pitcher & Stern; member of F. P. A. Board of Directors*

DR. ELSIE REED MITCHELL—*Co-author, "Vagabonding at Fifty"; in Russia 1923-25, 1929 and 1930*

DR. PITMAN B. POTTER—*Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin; member of the faculty of the Institut Universitaire des Hautes Études Internationales, Geneva, 1930-31*

ELISHA M. FRIEDMAN—*Economist and banker; vice-president, United Continental Corporation; author, "Labor and Reconstruction in Europe," etc.; in Russia 1930*

MRS. ETHEL ELY PATTISON—*Director, International Seed Service, Incorporated; recently made an extensive tour of government experimental stations in Russia*

BERNHARD KNOLLENBERG—*Lawyer, of Lord, Day & Lord; in Russia in 1929*

GEORGE NEBOLSINE—*Lawyer, of Cotton, Franklin, Wright & Gordon; former member of F. P. A. Research Staff*

LEWIS S. GANNETT—*Associate editor, New York Herald Tribune*

JULIER C. CHEVALIER—*Member of the staff of "The Standard Star" of New Rochelle; in Russia 1921-28*

Social Conditions in Soviet Russia

MR. JAMES G. McDONALD, Chairman

RUSSIA continues to be more in the news day by day rather than less, and today in New York there are two meetings on Russia: one of them at the Republican Club dealing with the political aspects of our government's relations with Russia, and the other our meeting here.

We have discussed many times the political aspects of the problem. Today we have asked our speakers to limit themselves to the social aspects of the experiment in Russia. We have three speakers, all of them Americans. The first speaker is Mr. William C. White, formerly an instructor in Modern History at the University of Pennsylvania, recently returned from Russia, where he was studying under the Penfield Scholarship, and has written a number of articles on Russia.

It is a great pleasure for me to introduce as our first speaker, Mr. William C. White.

MR. WILLIAM C. WHITE

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The Revolution has not changed the basic aspect of the Russian land. It is still primarily an agricultural country three-fourths of whose population live in those little villages that rise like clumps of russet mushrooms from the Russian plains. The other quarter of the population, the 29,000,000 out of 150,000,000 are quartered in a thousand cities, although thanks perhaps to hasty tourist visits, the impression is current abroad that there are but two cities left in Russia—Moscow and Leningrad.

The Revolution, however, has distinctly changed the character of the Russian cities. Those cities which have an industrial population, those cities which have an industrial foundation, are one group. Those cities which before the Revolution were trading centers, where that great class

who have now disappeared from Russia, the middle men, the traders lived, are the second group.

The Soviet government today is organized and conducted on a very definite class principle. The Communist party, with its 2,000,000 members, dictates in the interests of one specific class, the factory working class, the proletariat. This class is better off than all others. A similar differentiation runs through the cities. Those cities which have an industrial population are the cities which are better off. Those cities, which before the Revolution were the commercial centers, today are quiet, peaceful, gaining perhaps in population, but none the less quiescent places in the Russian land. Stalin himself made this differentiation clear in 1929 when in speaking of a prospective food shortage, he said: "We from the Center shall feed Moscow, Baku, Ivanovo-Voznesensk," he named a group of the larger industrial centers, "and the other places may look out for themselves."

This is the same policy which gives to the factory working class double the rations that the office working class, and the intelligentsia, enjoy. The differentiation of cities is the same policy written large. Cities like Moscow, like Baku, with its highly important oil industry, cities like Kharkov are the cities in which the development of social work is concentrated, where the population is best taken care of.

These are the cities in which the whole population of Russia desires to live. Here rations are higher. Here conditions are far better. If you take these cities and generalize about them, you are as far wrong in generalizing about Russia as if you would take New York and with it alone make generalizations about America. Turn to the small cities, the cities which before the Revolution were trading cities, Saratov, Samara, Ufa. Here conditions are quite different. I sat in one of the rooms in the best hotel in Ufa, a hotel which for some unknown proletarian reason is called Hotel Astoria. Here the President of the City Soviet said, "Oh, to be in Moscow! All we get here are slogans and paper orders."

I remember very well being in another little city, a city without a factory in it, and the postmaster said to me, "Every time I pack up a mail bag I think, 'O, God, if I could crawl inside it.' "

The Communist government has in its hand a very important power, a power which has not been emphasized in reports abroad: the power of switching food supplies, of shipping from place to place as it wishes the rather limited supplies of manufactured goods. Mr. Hindus can tell you in speaking of the villages what part control over supplies played in the early days of collectivization; how, when they wanted to reform villages the stores were filled with manufactured goods. You find this constantly that the industrial cities, cities like Moscow, Leningrad, Khartov, are citi

in which conditions are distinctly better than anywhere else in Russia. Whether or not they are making of the factory working class a favored class, I don't know. I don't think anybody can tell you. But the Russian population does realize and does feel very keenly that the industrial class and the industrial cities are better off. In 1929 before ration cards were introduced there came into Moscow from villages 500 and 1,000 miles around peasants to buy the bread that was in Moscow and was not in the villages. They bought so much that the *Izvestia* in Moscow, protested and said, "That has got to stop. The railroad stations smell like bakeries." Everybody came with bags and boxes and took things out.

Another result of placing a premium on life in the industrial centers has had tremendous effects on the Russian people. The Revolution has created great masses of office workers, non-Communists, for when a state controls all means of production and distribution there grows up a tremendous bureaucracy. They reside in cities, and feel that the greatest good in life is to hold your job and room in the cities. The same spirit exists among the non-Communist intelligentsia; consequently, any Moscow paper any morning carries advertisements saying, "Wanted an engineer, or technician, or trained accountant in some provincial district." High wages are offered, $300, $400 a month; but the trained specialists prefer to stay in the cities. Here is a result of the Revolution that is only too seldom emphasized. The city is better; and the provinces lack therefore trained workers.

Various newspapers have conducted campaigns among the graduates of the medical schools to see how many remain in the cities. They discovered to their great disgust that again and again students from proletarian ranks, often from the provinces, prefer to stay in Moscow as clerks, as porters, rather than go out into the provinces and practice their profession.

I think a small thing but nonetheless indicative is the fact that one of the minor punishments for counter-revolution in Russia is the sentence the court sometimes gives, "minus three" or "minus six"; that is, for minor cases of counter-revolution they exile individuals from the three largest cities or six largest cities in Russia. Here is a premium put on life in the industrial centers for these industrial centers are favored. The Communist party with its 2,000,000 men and women has its roots primarily in the factory working class. Moscow must be favored, Baku must be kept happy. These are the important centers. The Communist party follows perfectly those two axioms which lie so deep in all Russia on political life: the first is "there may be any number of parties in Russia on one condition, so long as one is in power and the rest are in jail." The second axiom is, "the most important thing of all is to stay in power." So the Communist party stays in power by making conditions better for the factory working class and for the cities in which they live.

These live cities, like the ones I have mentioned, have certain superficial

characteristics. First of all, is the tremendous overcrowding, an overcrowding that brings with it results often amazing, sometimes amusing. The average Moscow family, whether working in factory or in office, lives as a rule one family to a room or perhaps in a few cases one family to two rooms. A whole discussion of social conditions in Russia might devote itself to the subject of the result of overcrowded rooming conditions on the Russian people. I have found sometimes amazing results. For example, prostitution finds itself almost defeated in the Russian cities partly because of the room shortage. Likewise, what do you do, when you with your wife and five children suddenly find your mother-in-law appearing? What you do, of course, is to buy a mattress and let her sleep on that on the floor at night, and store the mattress in the corridor in the daytime.

In the apartment I lived in for a year there was a dentist's office. He was fortunate for he had two rooms. His young daughter complained to me that it was so difficult to get a husband because she and her boy friends had to stay, when they called at night, in her father's office, and "How can you be romantic when the whole place smells of antiseptic?"

And when crowded rooming conditions and somewhat free divorce laws combine, there are results that are almost unbelievable. One from personal experience: A couple had one room in Moscow. They found after six months of marriage that things were not so pleasant; consequently they decided they would take their vacations separately. He went to the Caucasus and she to Crimea. In the Caucasus he found a lady whom he liked much better and promptly divorced the first wife, after which he married the second. She in the Crimea found a man whom she cared for more than her husband; so she divorced him and married the other. So back to Moscow; but they had only one room. Both couples came to the same room and put up that article of furnishing which the Revolution has made all important, a curtain. The curtain hung in the middle of the room; on the one side were old wife and new husband, and on the other side old husband and new wife. I called upon them one day but left in haste. In six months I called again and found the curtain down and old wife and husband seated at a table drinking tea. "What is this?" I asked.

"Oh," said the husband, "it is this way. We got tired of that couple and kicked them out."

Now it is not part of the Communist program to make families live in one room. Because of the lack of money and because it is concentrating its reserves in industrial developments, the Soviet government pays less attention now to housing. It does build new apartment houses in Moscow and in other industrial centers; but unfortunately they do not in any way meet the tremendous rush to the cities where things are better. "Oh, to be in Moscow," is the cry that fills the trains to that city. Apartments in

Moscow are built on the building and loan basis. I lived in one apartment for a whole year in which all members of a theatre lived; the leading lady, leading man, comedian, washer, members of the orchestra, stagehands had all pooled together, contributed shares and built an apartment house in which each family had three rooms. Consequently, if you are going to generalize about living conditions in the cities you have to equate that fine "White City," in Baku, built specially for the oil workers with the freight cars along the Savyelovsky Railroad near the Moscow brick works where the workers live two families to a freight car.

There are other things in urban life besides room shortage and ration cards. Almost every Moscow family tries to keep a maid or a nurse if there are children; thus there is an extra person to stand in line for food products.

But there is something far more basic in urban life, the control which the government exercises over the people in the cities. The government can control an individual by trying and sentencing him to various and sundry penalties. But without court procedure there is a tremendous regimentation of the population. The government first of all therefore has the right to decide whether or not you shall have a job in the cities, since every government job in the cities is a trade union job, and since almost all city jobs are government jobs.

Secondly, because it is extremely difficult to secure food without ration cards, the government can likewise decide roughly what you shall eat and how much you can eat. It can likewise decide where you shall live since apartments are under government control, and it can at times expel those politically undesirable from their rooms. Its control over the urban population extends even to fashions. Most Moscow people wear clothes that come from the clothing trust there. A year ago they made a great mistake in the factory and turned out 3,000 suits of clothes with one leg of the trousers shorter than the other. They said, "Wear them anyway."

This control does not extend into the villages. In the villages, by being born there, one acquires the right of owning a piece of land out of which one can somehow or other scrape a living; but with the new collectivization movement, of which Mr. Hindus will tell you, they are possibly—I don't know accurately—extending the means for building up the same control that exists in the cities, the right to determine whether a man shall live or whether a man shall exist.

There is one thing I heard in Russia which I think possibly can sum up for you Russian conditions in the cities. It goes far deeper than the question of room shortage to which it applies. A friend of mine was teaching English. She gave to her students a theme, "What is your idea of an ideal home," and a girl of fifteen replied, "An ideal home is one through which somebody does not have to pass to get to his own room."

As one looks at urban life in Russia one sees the increasing control of the government over private life, an attempt to build up the same control over private life that they have in the economic and political life of the nation. Furthermore, one sees a differentiation of cities, an attempt arising possibly from motives of self-preservation to make of the industrial centers the best, the most thoroughly provided places in all the Russian land.

Thank you!

THE CHAIRMAN: The second speaker whom many of us know as an old friend and millions of people know because of his writings on Russia is Mr. Maurice Hindus. Mr. Hindus was born in Russia, is an American citizen, and has been there many times since the Revolution. No man, I think, has written on the Russian Revolution in a way to challenge the thought and imagination of as many people in this country at any rate as has Mr. Hindus. His books most of you know, "The Russian Peasant and the Revolution," "Broken Earth," "Humanity Uprooted." He has just told me that he is coming back to his old Russian village in a new book which will take up the theme of "Broken Earth" where that volume left off. I hope those of you who have not had the pleasure of reading "Broken Earth" will read it and then read the new one.

It is a great pleasure to introduce a friend and member of the Foreign Policy Association and an authority on Russia to this audience and the radio audience. Mr. Maurice Hindus!

MR. MAURICE HINDUS

MR. WHITE has spoken about the city, but 29,000,000 people live in the city. I shall speak about the 120,000,000 who live in the villages.

On one of the large collective farms in Central Russia I met an eighteen-year old girl who was one of the most exciting products of the Revolution that it has been my fortune to meet anywhere in Russia—very brave, very enthusiastic, very audacious. I asked her if, in the event that Russia went to war she would go to the front. She replied that nobody could keep her from going. I then asked her if she would shoot.

"Of course," she answered.

"Would you fight with bayonets?"

"With anything."

Then I said, "Is it not strange for a girl to talk like that?"

"Why?" she asked.

"Because," I replied tritely, "men have always been doing the fighting."

She flared with exasperation and replied, "We don't believe in 'always.' 'Always' means the past and we do not go to the past for wisdom or guidance."

I am mentioning this incident so as to lay the ground for a proper approach to Russia. If you come there with your American viewpoint, your American social attitude, your American conventions, your American conceptions of progress and civilization, and if you attempt to gauge Russia in terms of your American standards you cannot but fail to comprehend the outstanding features of the Revolution. You cannot approach Russia with a definite viewpoint. You cannot measure Russia with any yardstick excepting her own.

A lot of things that have happened there, particularly in the last year in the villages as well as in the cities, have been very cruel. Nevertheless, it is revolution. Revolution means war. And war knows no sentiment; war knows no mercy. In war you hate your enemy; you fight him; you seek to destroy him and you say all the mean things you can about him.

To me the attack on the *kulak* in the last year can be explained only on the ground that in war you are doing everything you possibly can to the person you want to crush. You see Russian motion pictures and you think that the *kulak* is the most monstrous human being in the world. You think that here is a man who eats a dozen live babies for breakfast and a score for supper, a man who cannot live unless he inbibes oceans of human blood.

Then you go out into the villages and you see the *kulak* and you discover that he lives almost in the same manner as do the rest of the peasants.

An industrious fellow with a little more imagination than the average *muzhik,* he has perhaps employed some hired labor. At the end of the year he has had a little surplus and has begun to build an estate, to acquire an accumulation. Therefore he is a symbol of private property and the Revolution says private property shall not exist, and those who seek it shall go. To make the fight on the *kulak* more or less natural, they heap on him all the charges they can and picture him as an atrocious monster.

I believe that collectivization of the land at the pace with which it has been carried on would have been utterly impossible without crushing the *kulak.* With him in the village, rapid collectivization would have been impossible, because as one of the members of the Commissariat of Agriculture in Moscow said to me, "Every peasant has his own Five-Year Plan. On its completion he wants to be a *kulak.*" If you have the example of successful farmers in the villages, the rest of the peasant population will want to emulate that example. The thing therefore to do is to get rid of that example and that is what the revolutionaries have tried to do. It was a cruel thing, this liquidation of the *kulak,* but cruelty is one of the chief weapons of the Revolution.

There are certain conditions inherent in Russian history, in the character of the Russian peasant, which have paved the way for collectivization. Please do not imagine that collectivization is entirely a result of theory or dogma.

The Russian peasant is the most abysmally ignorant farmer in the whole of Eastern Europe. Any one of you who has been in Russia will agree with me when I say that the cucumber is the national vegetable of Russia. I am quite sure, that with the exception of those of you who have visited Russia, I have eaten more cucumbers in the last seven years than all the rest of you put together. If you want to go to Russia and be happy, you want to develop a passion for cucumbers. Everywhere you go in the villages (and the peasants always want to be nice to you)—it is cucumbers, cucumbers, cucumbers. Yet to this day the average Russian peasant does not know how properly to grow cucumbers.

Next to the cucumber, the vegetable in importance in Russia is the cabbage. Many of you have dined and lived in the Savoy and know what cabbage soup is. Russia is the classic land of cabbage soup and you know that it is such a land before you ever get there because you can smell that soup miles away. Yet, depending on the cabbage as much as the peasant does, well—you should see him plant his cabbage. With the exception of the Ukraine where the peasants are a bit more advanced, the average *muzhik* works on the principle that the more plants there are in a row, the

more cabbage there is going to be; the result is that the heads are small, soft and wormy.

Watch the peasant sowing grain. He never prepares a proper seed bed for the simple reason that his toothpick harrow is incapable of doing so. He does his sowing by hand. Then he runs his harrow over the field and doesn't cover up well the grain. Crows come along and pick out a good deal of it and the winds blow more of it into adjacent furrows.

Again the land division in Russia, a heritage of feudalism, is the most atrocious thing in the world. In the old days, about 25 per cent of it belonged to the landlords. They were fairly decent farmers and produced good crops. All of the landlords' land has passed into the hands of the peasants and the peasants have cut it up into little narrow strips.

Here is Mr. McDonald, and here is Mr. Warburg. I am in between. Here is a strip of land (pardon me, Mr. McDonald for the allegory) and here is another strip of land (pardon the allegory, Mr. Warburg). Here I am in between. I am supposed to be a fence, only I am not. There are no fences in Russia. I am only a narrow ridge of grassy land dividing this strip of land from that.

The man who owns this strip of land (pointing to the right) will sow it with good wheat. The man who owns that strip of land (pointing to the left) will also sow it with good wheat. I am in between. Nobody bothers about me. Nobody has a right to touch me, because I am No Man's land. But I grow lusty weeds and I contaminate the crops on either side of me.

Such is the condition all over Russia wherever the strip system is in practice. The result is that the peasant whose land is divided into such strips never can raise clean grain.

Let us consider now another phase of farming—stock breeding. I was born in a Russian village. Later when I came to this country, I worked on a farm in the northern part of New York State, on a dairy farm. On that farm in New York we used to clean our cow stable twice and three times a day. We would whitewash it about twice a year. We would currycomb the cows nearly every morning. We would wash the windows very often. We did all we could to keep the cows dry and clean and comfortable. How often do you suppose the average Russian peasant cleans his cow stables? In my village when I was a boy they cleaned the cow stables twice a year. Last summer I was in the same village and they are still cleaning the cow stables twice a year.

Windows they never wash for the simple reason they have no windows in the cow stables. They never whitewash walls. Hence their scrubby breeds of cattle do not give much meat and do not yield much milk.

The condition in the Ukraine and in the North Caucasus where you have the more advanced type of peasant is a little better, but the average run of cattle even there is far inferior to the average run of cattle in this country.

In my travels last summer I came across many peasants who had Rhode Island hens. I know something about Rhode Island hens, but a Rhode Island hen in Russia is an entirely different product from what it is in this country. Somehow the poor thing has degenerated there. The average Russian egg weighs two-thirds as much as the average American egg.

When you have a condition of farming like that, you have an agricultural crisis on your hands. From year to year since the coming of the Soviets, this condition was growing progressively worse because the peasants were subdividing and subdividing the land. In 1917 there were 17,000,000 individual farms in Russia. Ten years later there were 27,000,000 farms in Russia, an increase of 10,000,000. If the process of land division continued without anybody checking it, Russia would have launched into a hopeless catastrophe. When you have a condition like that, let me repeat, you have to do something to remedy it.

Then there is the political situation. The Bolsheviks, as you know, do not believe in private property. About 4 or 5 per cent of the peasants in Russia are fairly prosperous farmers. They are the so-called *kulaks*. At the end of the year they have a small accumulation. About three years ago the Soviets began to attack them, fine them, tax them, limit their political rights, their social privileges.

Now the Russian peasant is a pretty shrewd fellow with quite a deep spirit of revenge. He struck back at the Soviets in the only way he could. He began to limit artificially the productivity of his land. Instead of having ten acres of wheat he had two; instead of keeping six cows he kept two; instead of fifty hens, he kept only five or ten. This of course was very bad for the country. Now when you have two such conditions, namely, the abysmal ignorance of the average farmer and the artificial limitation of output of the more successful farmer, you have two conditions that are leading the country toward a catastrophe. To avert the catastrophe the revolutionaries jumped on the plan of collectivization.

I, for one, had always imagined that the peasant would not under any circumstances accept collectivization. I want to admit that I have completely changed my mind on this question. The Russian peasants in about four or five years are going to be collectivized all over the country for the simple reason, that considering Russian conditions the collective farm as a method of production is unbeatable. Incidentally the collectivization of the land would have been impossible without the American tractor, the American mowing machine, the American thrashing machine, the Ameri-

can combine. It is these machines that are supposed to do the work on the collective farm and the average peasant with his primitive implements never could plow or sow or reap as well or as much as he can with these machines.

Last summer in traveling about in villages all over the country, I could easily spot the lands of the collective farm and of the individual peasant. Even when both had a good crop, on the collective farms it was immensely superior to that of the individual peasant.

Please remember that collective farming means not only a stupendous agricultural revolution, which in my judgment will make Russia within two or three years the leading grain-growing country of the world, but also a stupendous social revolution, far more stupendous than the nationalization of industry in the city has brought about.

That does not mean that the Russian peasant on the average joins the collective farm willingly. He does not. The older generation of peasants, in my judgment, will never be able to adapt themselves to the new scheme of life on the collective farms. They have been brought up in the individualistic system of society and will miss a good many things. In one village in the province of Tambov, in the north, I asked a peasant why he didn't join a nearby successful collective farm.

He said, "Why should I? In the summertime I work hard. In the wintertime I want to take it easy. I want to lie at the top of the oven and spit at the ceiling. On a collective farm I could not do that."

In another place, a man said to me "They are building big barns on our collective farm, big piggeries, bigger and better than any landlord ever built. The cows there are going to be comfortable and the pigs, too. Soon they will also build big houses in which we are going to live. But we won't be any better off than the pigs and the cows in the stables. We'll be in stalls and in stanchions. We won't have any independence."

Again, the Russian peasant is addicted to drink. If you ever got stuck in the mud in a Russian road you would realize why it is necessary for the peasant to get drunk once in a while. And so last summer peasants would say to me, "When we join a collective farm, we won't get any grain for homebrew." And since most Russian peasants make homebrew they do not think well of collectivization. These are little things, but they are very important to the peasant. Therefore I say that the older generation is not gladly or willingly joining the collective farms. Many of them are fighting the movement desperately. Nevertheless, collective farming is going to absorb them all, because the individual peasant, even if he is a good farmer, cannot begin to compete in output with the American machine or the machine which they are now producing in Russia.

Let us look at the social aspects of this Revolution. In the first place, religion will collapse. Of course, religion in the village has been dying steadily all the time. This is not the place to go into a lengthy discussion of religion in Russia, but the fact is that as you go through Russian villages you discover that churches are collapsing and the peasants are indifferent to the collapse.

In one village last summer I met a brilliant priest. He said, "I don't know how much longer I shall be able to maintain my parish here. Just think of this. Last Sunday one of the parishoners came to have a baby christened. He said to me, 'Little father, you have christened five of my babies and this is the sixth. If I have any more, I am not going to have them christened.' And I said 'Why not?' and the peasant replied, 'Because I am joining a collective farm.' And I said, 'Why should that make any difference. The law does not forbid you to have your religion if you join a collective farm.' 'The law,' answered the *muzhik,* 'has nothing to do with it. On a collective farm you have an entirely new system of civilization. You don't need any church, any God, and you don't need any christenings.' "

In any village that turns into a collective farm, the propaganda against the church is loosened, and somehow or other the vast majority of the older people get sucked into a spirit of infidelity. I believe the first thing which will disappear on a collective farm will be the church and religion as we understand the word.

In the second place, the collective farm will usher in a new community in the world. The thousands upon thousands of backward, sprawling, dilapidated, filthy Russian villages will be torn down. Some are being torn down already. In their place, new agricultural townships will spring into existence. These townships will be more or less completely socialized. On the more successful collective farms, this process of *socialization* has already begun.

It will proceed at a much faster pace in the villages on the collective farms than in the cities. One of the first things they build when they organize a collective farm, is a nursery. At present, the children stay in the nursery only in the daytime. They hope to reach a point where they will be able to build a children's home, and keep the children there in the daytime and at night. That does not mean, of course, that the children are or will be forcibly taken away from their parents.

On some of the successful collective farms where they have good nurseries, it works out this way. In the center perhaps is the nursery, all around are the houses in which the parents live. There is a communal kitchen and a dining room. All the children and parents eat there. At night when they get through with their labors they go perhaps to the park

and play and it isn't you playing with your children, but everybody playing with everybody else's children.

What you are having is the birth of (I hate to use the word because it is liable to be misunderstood) a new kind of family, a sort of collectivistic family. That does not mean the collapse of the family or of monogamy as basic institutions. Nothing of the sort. Anybody who goes along saying that in Russia the family is collapsing, that the country is ridden with promiscuity and moral debauchery, hasn't begun to understand the Russian Revolution. I am quite sure that any of you who have been in Moscow and other cities and Leningrad, have been surprised to find that in its outward aspect of life the Russian community, is extremely puritanical. This is a long question to go into. Nevertheless, monogamy is firmly intrenched in Russia.

Home life likewise is not disappearing but it is changing its form. It is becoming more or less collectivized. This frightens a good many people, perhaps rightly so, but remember that to the Russian peasant this is not a great calamity because he has no sense of privacy.

Last summer I got to a Russian village early in June in time for the Trinity Festival, which is a popular wedding season among peasants. There were several weddings in the village and at all of them doors were open. Nobody was receiving any invitations. Everybody was welcome. Together with everybody in the village, I marched from one wedding to another and everywhere we went we were welcomed and we helped celebrate.

Come to a Russian peasant any time of the day or night, whether he is asleep or awake, whether he is eating or playing, and you don't intrude. You just don't, because the Russian peasant has no sense of privacy. It is much easier therefore for him to adapt himself to the new scheme of life than it would be, say, for the highly individualized Anglo-Saxon.

Again let me emphasize that you must look on Russia in terms of Russian conditions and Russian history and not in terms of American conditions and American history. The Russian peasant is discovering a new standard of living. When I came out of Moscow at the end of last September, I met Russians, emigrés, in Paris and Berlin, who said to me, "But isn't the peasant starving? Isn't the Russian peasantry being smashed to pieces?"

Well, the 4 or 5 per cent who belong to the so-called *kulak* group are being smashed to pieces ruthlessly. But I say without fear of contradiction, that the Russian peasant on the whole has never maintained such a high standard of living as he does now. That is one reason why the standard of living is lower in the city than it ever has been since the coming of the Revolution.

Last summer I traveled with a group of five Americans in villages all over the country. Some of them are in this audience. They will testify that while it was difficult to buy butter, cheese, meat in Moscow and in other cities, in the villages everywhere we went we had all the butter and cheese and meat we wanted to eat. The peasant had it. That does not mean that there were not certain sections of Russia where the peasant did suffer from a shortage of fats or even grain. There were. Russia is a large country and there are 120,000,000 peasants there. In places government agents collected too much grain from peasants and they in turn slaughtered too much of their stock, with the result that they suffered from a shortage of food. But I am not speaking of isolated localities. I am not speaking of exceptional groups. I am speaking of the mass of peasantry as a whole and the fact is that in spite of the barbarities of Soviet organizers last winter, peasants now eat much better food than they ever did in the old days, and they certainly are much better dressed.

In my own village when I was a boy, the peasants didn't know what a handkerchief was. Last summer I found them all using handkerchiefs, at least on Sunday. In the old days the young fellow who sported a pair of boots on Sunday was the favorite with all the girls in the village. Last summer when I was there every young fellow had fine boots. In the old days no peasant there ever dreamed of a collar and tie. Last summer—Edward Dawes, who represents the International News Service in Moscow was with me—the boys in my village were wearing collars and ties on Sunday.

At one of the weddings I attended, we were sitting around the table waiting for the bride. Finally she came in, a girl of about seventeen, and her cheeks were almost plastered with rouge. In the old days no peasant girl had heard of rouge. On investigating conditions in the government store in that village, I learned that sometimes there is a shortage of soap there, sometimes a shortage of nails, sometimes a shortage of textile goods but never is there a shortage of rouge, perfume and lipstick.

You might say that this is not of very great importance, yet it is. You watch these peasants as I have been watching them for the last seven years and every time something new comes to the village, it adds to the fullness of their life, gives them a sense of ampler living. Incidentally the girls who use lipstick and rouge and perfume, do so because these things come from the city, and city products are supposed to give a person distinction and stimulate his pride.

To me there is not the least doubt that the peasant is discovering a new and even rising standard of living. That is important. Then the peasant is discovering something else— political-mindedness. He never was a politically-minded human being. At heart he always was an anarchist with a negative attitude toward government. For the first time in history

especially with the formation of collective farms, the peasant has to learn something about the function of political institutions. He cannot ignore them any more because under a system of collectivization, he becomes a part of these institutions. For the first time in history, the Russian peasant is becoming politically-minded.

Likewise, for the first time in history he is discovering organization. In the old days he never was organized. I for one believe that if in 1920 the Russian peasants had been organized, the Bolsheviks would not have remained in power. But the collective farm means organization. Within three or four years, all Russian peasants will be organized.

Please notice then the social aspects of this Revolution. The peasant is discovering a higher standard of living and new ideas about the outside world. He is discovering the machine and all that it implies in the change of human psychology. He is discovering political-mindedness and organization. Fifteen, twenty, thirty, forty years from now, what is he going to do? Who knows? Who can tell? The Bolsheviks will say to you, "We will make a Communist out of him. He will be part of us and we will all be Communists." Perhaps. I am not so sure that they are right. Supposing they are wrong? Then what? I am sure I don't know.

All I can say is this: the final word of the Russian Revolution will not have been heard of until the Russian peasant, organized and politically-minded, has had his say.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have one more speaker who is going to speak to us briefly, and then we will have the usual question period, somewhat longer than usual, in which the members of this audience will have an opportunity to ask Mr. Hindus questions, questions of Mr. White or Miss Shuler, who is to speak now.

You may have noticed this meeting today does not seem to be so much of a debate as Foreign Policy Association meetings usually are. Mr. White spoke about the cities, and Mr. Hindus has spoken about the country, and perhaps Miss Shuler will inject that element of controversy into the meeting which some of you have come to associate with these meetings; but I can't speak for her. I will let her speak for herself. It is a great pleasure now to introduce Miss Marjorie Shuler, of *The Christian Science Monitor,* whose articles on Russia have attracted wide attention. Miss Shuler!

MISS MARJORIE SHULER

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MY FRIENDS: I am absolutely opposed to the present system of government in Russia because I believe that it's a denial of personal liberty, its domination of the acts, the words, even the thoughts of its citizens is the greatest wrong which any political system can do to any people.

Freedom has been the goal of mankind, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, free use of the right to vote, free labor, freedom of religion. None of these measures of a free country exist in Russia today, and yet we are asked to look upon it as the most advanced form of government which the world has yet produced.

I left my yardstick behind me when I went into Russia last year. I count myself a liberal, and I went into Russia with all the interest and sympathy possible to see a new experiment of government. I came out with a feeling of distaste for the despotism which I saw in Russia, a deep pity for those who are compelled to live under that system, and a great hope that the people who have suffered so much will find a way to real liberty.

I rejoice with Mr. Hindus over the advances which have come about in social conditions in Russia. It is nice, as he says that the girls in the villages can get rouge and lipstick, but with all due apology to him, I contend that war has never solved human problems, and that to conduct yourself as though you were in a state of warfare only increases the problems under which you must live. I, too, found the women of Russia believed they belonged to themselves, and that they will carry guns as Mr. Hindus says or do anything else which they wish to do. But after I have followed the women of the world as I have from international convention to international convention, and have seen the women of the other countries with a belief that they owe a duty and responsibility to the world which is greater than self-ownership, I cannot help but hope that the ideals of the women of other countries will prevail rather than the ideals which the women of Russia are advancing today.

It is true great masses of Russian people are learning to read and to write. but will that mean intellectual power if they can read and write only what the government permits? Technically the people hold the land, but if a dictatorial control is to govern their tenancy and the conditions of their production, what stake have they in the development of the country? It is said there is employment for every Russian, but will that bring him happiness if he can take only the task which the government decrees he shall have, have only what the government permits him to earn, and then be unable to buy sufficient food and clothing, or get security for himself.

I shall never forget the white-haired woman whom I saw kneeling in the streets of Leningrad, sweeping up with her hands the contents of a bag of white meal which she had spilled in the dirt. I shall never forget the women I saw in country villages, as well as in large cities, standing six and eight hours in front of a shop to buy food and then often be told there was no food to buy. I shall never forget seeing a thousand people stand all of one day before a shop in Moscow where it was rumored that shoes would be sold—at $45 a pair. With these memories it is perhaps natural I should not be overly enthusiastic about that great modern experiment of kitchen factories, about which so many of the pro-Soviet speakers are talking. If it is possible for the government to deliver food in fixed quantities at regular hours and at moderate prices so that people can be served, twelve and fifteen thousand of them a day in those kitchen factories, then it would be possible for the government to deliver food under the same conditions to the food shops unless the government wished to remain in control of the food situation for some reason of its own.

Furthermore, when I look at the condition of mass eating, as I saw mass recreation and mass play, it does not seem to me that is a disinterested attitude for the development of Russia but rather a means of retaining control of the Russian's thoughts and his words, even when he is at play. It is natural around a family table that children shall acquire something of the opinions of their parents. It is natural if you and I go out to amuse ourselves with a group of people whom we naturally choose that we develop a certain allegiance to our friends. But the Soviet government, with the radio bringing its party messages, with the party pamphlets and party workers active everywhere, uses mass eating and mass recreation and mass play as a means of breaking down every allegiance and every adherence save that of wholehearted service to communism.

To my sense of things the anti-religious movement is just another phase of this attempt to put communism first and alone. Religious adherence might interfere with allegiance to communism, so it was not sufficient to weaken the power of the Russian church. It was not sufficient to let the people go forth to find God as they might, to try to find some power of supreme good outside of human finite forms. No, it was necessary to make the people of Russia deny that there is a God.

My first contact with the anti-religious movement came in a Moscow school where I saw the pictures of sodden, wretched, degenerate human beings, whom the children had drawn after they had received their anti-religious instruction and had labeled these terrible creatures of their whimsy, God.

A few days later I met the manager of the Militant Society of Godless Man, and there are three phases of our conversation which I should like to pass on to you. The first was his emphasis upon the fact that his is a

Militant Society of Godless Man, not a passive state of unbelief, you see, but an aggressive attempt to break down the faith of the world.

The second point was this. I asked him what ethical instruction is being substituted for religious training. He said, "None. A good Communist needs no ethical teaching. Communism is his religion. He does what is right because he does it for his party and against capitalism."

The third point was this. I asked him, without reference to faith or creed, what was the attitude toward such ethical standards as those enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount. He replied, "We deny them. We do not believe in the brotherhood of man. With us the mass is everything; the individual nothing."

I ask you, what kind of a mass can you have unless it is made up of individuals, who are sound, intelligent and righteous.

But there is another substitute for religion which my friend, the manager of the Militant Society of Godless Man, did not mention. The Five-Year Plan is almost a Bible to some of the Russian people. I do not pretend to translate it, much less to interpret it. I only know I was asked to believe that industrial enterprises are being efficiently and honestly developed in the interior, while I walked over holes in the street and around piles of stone which had been dumped there apparently months before without any repairs being made. While I watched people hungry and cold because of the breakdown of the system of distribution of food and materials, and while in spite of all there is to be done in Russia, I saw thousands of people apparently idle on the streets day after day.

The late Czarina has been held up to the world as an example of the destructiveness of superstition. I saw that room which she left on her last long journey to a Siberian cellar. I saw the 800 icons which hang upon its walls with the upturned horseshoes, the sacred fish, the bowl of sand from Jerusalem. A strange, strange depth of superstition! Yet as I stood there I wondered how different it was from the kind of superstition that I had seen poured out with regard to the Five-Year Plan: to this idol of steel and iron which is being substituted for the religious faith of a people, this form of materialism, which in some mystic way is to feed and clothe these people.

I may be unfair to Russia and any speaker or any writer about Russia may be unfair as an individual, but at least our opinions have been arrived at as honestly and intelligently as we know how to reach them. But what the Russian thinks of the rest of the world is being dictated by his government. The cold and hungry man who is home from his employment on Wednesday, while his wife's day off may be Tuesday, and the children are at home from school on Monday, is told no matter how badly off he is

the worker in the United States is worse off. Through the radio, through the party speaker, through the government controlled newspapers, he is told about the employment riots and bread riots in New York City.

I talked with some soldiers from Odessa in the Ukraine. They had been told how severe is army discipline in America and how fortunate they should be because their officers were one with them on this trip. I went to a motion picture factory and saw half a dozen propaganda films in the process of being made. I went to a recreation park in Kiev, and heard the actors ridicule an American capitalist. I went to hear Mozart played in the Red Army Park in Moscow, and as the beautiful music came across the gardens, I looked up, and before me were four tall wooden figures, painted to represent the capitalist, the priest, the Fascist, the rich farmer: the reminders to the Russian people even there in the park of their duty to hate. It seems to me that that hatred for the outside world is being utilized as a weapon to distract their attention from what is wrong at home, and unify them against the outside world; and that they are learning that lesson of hatred is proven by the fact that on every few houses and every few shops in the big cities hang the shields bearing the scythe and hammer which indicate that the occupant of this house or shop has paid his bit toward the chemical warfare fund of Russia.

After I had seen these things I better understood the attitude of Russia's neighbors. When I was last in Norway seven years ago, I sat in the Parliament and saw a good sized block of Communist members in action. This year there is none. When I was in Sweden I was told it was a great pity I had to go to Russia; and in Finland, my friends said they would not cross the boundary line, no not for anything. Then I came out to Poland and saw that great standing army for which a quarter of the national budget is being expended. Oh, my friends, communism is here as a challenge to capitalism, and no armies will keep it inside of Russia so long as there is a breakdown in the capitalist system which leaves any cold or hungry or despairing man to think that communism is the answer to his problem. The pity of it is that communism does not clothe nor feed nor give him happiness nor security, and that worse than all of these its system of control of the individual is such that at every point it is liable to misuse and to petty graft, to be used against the individual. I think the truest words I heard spoken in Russia were those of my friend, the manager of the Militant Society of Godless Man, "With us the mass is everything; the individual is nothing."

THE CHAIRMAN: I have never presided over a Russian meeting or been present at one at which the question period was not more lively and usually more interesting than the main part of the meeting. I anticipate today's occasion will be no exception to that general rule.

The first question is addressed to Mr. Hindus and raises an old point which I have been very anxious to have authoritatively answered. Mr. Hindus has not said he would answer it authoritatively but he would do the best he could.

The question is this: *How far have the Communists been able to uproot the profit motive from the masses, and do you think they will succeed entirely?*

MR. HINDUS: The second part of the question I shall not answer for the simple reason that I am no prophet. The first part of the question I could answer by saying that the motive of material gain has not even been attacked. The motive of material accumulation has been attacked, but not of material gain. A year ago and last summer I traveled with organizers of collective farms. I attended many of the mass meetings they called. Invariably they reminded me of the Chatauqua organizers in the Middle West. The Chatauqua organizer comes to a town and tries to sell the idea to the leading citizens of the town. He says to them, "If you bring our Chatauqua, you will get so much sweetness and light." The Soviet organizer when he gets into a village tries to enlist the support of the leading citizens of the community for his idea, but instead of speaking of sweetness and light, he promises them better food, better homes, better schools, better medical attention, fire-fighting machinery and all the other things the peasants need. They are continually playing upon the urge of material enjoyment. The one thing that they seek to change is the motive —from individual to social accumulation. In other words, while in the Western world the slogan is—"the more I have, the more I am going to enjoy," in Russia they are seeking to transmute this slogan into, "the more we have, the more I enjoy." Whether it is going to succeed or not, I am sure I don't know, and it will take more than one generation to prove to the world whether or not this change of motive is going to succeed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Here is another question addressed to Mr. Hindus. It is this: *Does Mr. Hindus think that the average Russian is less reliable and less happy without the old so-called religion?*

MR. HINDUS: Of course, I had no yardstick going into Russia. Although Miss Shuler said she had no yardstick, she had more than a yard of a kind of a stick. Miss Shuler said that they are scoffing at religion which they are of course, and if you are earnestly religious you are not going to like it. But I say this: Religion has never meant to the Russian

easant what it has meant to the Westerner. The Russian peasant never vas truly religious. He always was a pagan. Religion to him always was n external thing, and an external thing can be easily smashed by an exernal force. It was different with the peasant who came under the inuence of Protestant teachings. The Baptist or Evangelical peasant deives a great deal of comfort and solace from his religion. But the Protestant peasants are a very small minority. There are only one and a alf million of them.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have here at the guest table a Russian, whom ome of you may have heard at our meeting some months ago, either on he radio or here at the meeting, Mr. Raffalovich, who has had long exerience in Russia and outside of Russia, and he has asked for permission o ask Mr. Hindus a series of questions. Mr. Raffalovich and I have just ad a conference, and as a result of that conference I have concluded that ve will let him ask two questions and give some of the rest of you a hance. If we run out, we can come back to him again.

MR. RAFFALOVICH: I am trying to decide which of my questions are he most important. I choose two at random.

Is Mr. Hindus aware that the improvement of conditions of living mongst the agricultural population of Russia is the consequence of the and passing into the hands of the peasants, partly as a result of pre-war gislation, especially the law of 1906, partly as a result of the Democratic, ot the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, which gave the balance of the land the peasants? This is my first question.

The second question I want to put at once is the following: *Is Mr. Hindus aware that communism through theoretical application of its unerlying idea, through its system as well as through the ruthless application of that system, means all along the enforced labor, and cannot mean nything else when the whole apparatus is in the hands of the government s regards industry and trade; and that collectivization of farms means an ttempt to apply the same system of forced labor also to agriculture, which e must distinguish between free cooperation, which existed also in the ussian peasant class before and was being developed, and forced collectivization?*

MR. HINDUS: In answer to the first question of Mr. Raffalovich, I do ant to say this: the Democratic government, which existed in Russia beore the Soviets came, did not give the land to the peasants. I will also o so far as to say that the Bolsheviks did not quite give the land to the easants. The peasants went out with axes and guns and took the land. he Bolsheviks came into power and legalized the seizure of the land.

In reply to the second question, I would say in the first place, that there

is no communism in Russia. I was amazed that Miss Shuler in speakir of Russia spoke of communism. I have never met a single Communi in Russia who would say that there is communism in the land now. The is not even socialism. All there is is state capitalism, and that is all the is. What Russia will turn into in the future, nobody knows. Certa communistic features do prevail, but only certain ones. This state cap talism is seeking the rough ruthless methods to have its will and way r alized in everyday life. Whether this is going to make people happie whether this is going to result in forced labor, whether this is going result in emancipated labor, all these questions I cannot answer for t simple reason, that Russia is in a state of flux, and when a country is a state of flux you can't say what it is going to crystallize into.

Supposing collectivization of the land collapses. I don't believe it wi Yet I am no prophet. Supposing it collapses, then the whole of Russ collapses, everything sinks into chaos and our prophecies and speculatio blow up into smoke.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to have a question from the floor.

MR. CHERNIKOFF: *I would like to find out from Mr. Hindus if t Soviet government is such an advanced form of government, why did th find it necessary to expel to the northern sections of Russia 600,0 peasants, out of which 72,000 have died preparing lumber for the Unit States?*

MR. HINDUS: I am terribly sorry my voice didn't carry to the far e of the balcony, and I do plead with you in asking questions addressed me that you would please not try to put into my words thoughts whi were never there. I never said the Soviet government is an advanced for of government. I did say that collectivization brought about the destru tion of a whole group of peasants, 4 per cent of them. What I did t to impress upon you is that certain processes are at work. I didn't s advanced processes. I didn't say backward processes. I had no yar stick with which to measure these processes. I did say at the conclusi that certain forces are operating in Russia whereby the standard of livi of the Russian peasant is rising. I did not even say that this rise would have occurred under any other government but the Soviet. Please do n put into my words ideas which were never there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know now that Mr. Hindus is an optimist. I ha a new definition for an optimist, someone who speaks on Russia and thin he is going to be understood by everybody as he meant to be understoo That simply can't be done. It might be done in Russia, but never done America.

Where is somebody who has a question to put to Mr. Hindus or someone lse, which the questioner will admit bears directly on what he said?

QUESTION: *I understood him to say distinctly that the rulers of Russia re carrying on war amongst their own people. May I ask him if he be- eves that if they are successful or partly successful and build up tre- nendous industrial and mechanized civilization there, will they start to arry on war on their neighbors?*

MR. HINDUS: Search me, brother!

THE CHAIRMAN: Apparently, Mr. Hindus isn't going to be made a rophet anyhow. Where is there another question?

QUESTION: *The Russian peasant is being robbed of his religion now. would like to know whether Miss Shuler knew how much the Russian enefited by the Czarist régime when they all had religion but nothing else.*

MISS SHULER: I am very glad to have that question asked because it o happens I am not an optimist. Mr. Hindus put an idea into my words hat was never there. Although you know I had a very short time to speak nd had to speak very rapidly, I hoped that I had made clear that my uarrel with the present government of Russia was not anything that had o do with its particular definition of religion, but my quarrel is that the ussian people are not being allowed to find God in their own way, which s something quite different from faith or creed or kind of religion. My uarrel is that a country which denies the existence of a Supreme Being hich is God, is opening itself to destruction, poverty, famine, pestilence nd every other kind of thing that comes to the individual or group of eople who look only to humanity and to materialism and deny spiritu- lity and a law or principle of good which you and I and many other eople call God, but have different ideas in our minds when we name Him.

QUESTION: *I should like to ask Mr. Hindus whether, granting forced bor exists in lumber camps, does Mr. Hindus conform that it is merely nvict labor, or will he admit such labor is inevitably the consequence of e present form of state capitalism?*

MR. HINDUS: In the first place, I know very little about the lumber in- ustry. I have never been up North in the big forests. I have never sited the camps and cannot really speak authoritatively on that subject. will say, however, that if there is convict labor (and I think it is a very rious question, and ought to be stressed) then certainly it is only a result f the present régime and of nothing else. Does it mean that there were o régimes in Russia in the old days that had no convict labor?

Those of you who have read George Cannon's book on "Siberia and t Exile System," will remember the kind and quality of convict labor whi existed in Russia in the old days, so it is nothing new. But if there convict labor in Russia now, it is only a result of the present system, fact, almost anything in Russia at present is a result of the present go ernment.

QUESTION: *Explain for us the apparent contradiction, the idea of soc wealth and the sale of state securities to individuals. Will one of the spea ers speak on that?*

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's try Mr. White. He has had a long rest. L us see if he can tell us the distinction.

MR. WHITE: Since 1921 there have been, I think, four or five bon issues sold in Russia. They have been sold on a more or less forced bas If any of you want to buy Soviet bonds, I can tell you where to buy the They pay 8 to 10 per cent, and have lottery prizes up to 50,000 rubles a tached. The idea, I think, comes from a number of sources. First of a they did not introduce bond sales into Russia until they found they cou get no capital abroad, which they discovered in 1921.

Since that time, they have felt the population must contribute to t industrialization of the country and they must contribute on the basis turning over a certain percentage of their wages a year, which amoun roughly, to a month's wages per year, through more or less forcible bon sales.

These bonds can be sold back to the government, although one of t papers announced last year that "in that bourgeois world there existed t freedom of right to sell your bonds back. We will put the new bond iss on a proletarian basis," which means they could not be sold back. The is no contradiction of social principle involved. The population helped contribute for the industrialization of the country for which they get t same return of interest we would get here. That is rather superficia The point they would stress is no industry in Soviet Russia pays a sing penny to stockholders. That is, all the profits made from industry go in the government, and from there are distributed through the various a sundry social institutions which exist.

THE CHAIRMAN: Here is a question addressed to Mr. Hindus, whi deals with one of the subjects he undoubtedly talked about. I hope he going to admit it, because he says: *How much chance is there, Mr. Hindu for individualism to come out of this collectivization which will mean mo leisure for each individual? Would each farmer, under the collective sy tem, have enough time to become an individual?*

MR. HINDUS: I not only admit I discussed this question, Mr. McDonald, I confess it. Again, this is asking a question which relates to the future. Mass collectivization has been in existence in Russia only for one year. What is going to happen to the individual under this collectivized system I simply can't answer, because I have no prophetic vision or prophetic powers. The revolutionaries say (all I can tell you is what they say) that with the new cultural possibilities and with the new leisure you will have a higher type of individual than the world has ever known.

But that is what they say and a lot of things that they say a person does not necessarily have to believe. I won't believe the answer to this particular question until I have seen it come through in actual every-day life.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have less than ten minutes left. There is still time for one or two or three good questions.

QUESTION: *I would like to ask Mr. Hindus what reaction he has found in the peasantry and the attitude toward the Red Army, as a result of the mental and material changes which the peasantry has undergone. Will the peasant today make as good a soldier as he was, let us, at the beginning of the Revolution?*

MR. HINDUS: Please remember, all of you, that there are certain things in Russia which a good many of us don't try to investigate too closely and the army is one of those things. I can't say as to whether the Russian peasant is a better soldier than in the old days, because I am not a military man. I will say this: The army is one of the leading schools of the Soviet government, and of the Communist party, and in that school they train not only soldiers but leaders for the villages and you will find a great many of the people who are chairmen of Soviets in villages, heading the Collectivist Movement, or a lot of other political work, are products of the Red Army.

QUESTION: *I would like to ask Mr. White whether any official statements have been made to the citizens of Russia which lead them to believe that there is a policy which Russia might carry out if the Five-Year Plan is successful in spreading communism to the outside world?*

MR. WHITE: I think in answering that one can go back to 1917—back particularly to July of 1918—when the new constitution was drawn up. I happened to get my hands on the confidential minutes of the committee that drew up the constitution. In those minutes there was a statement that the Russian Soviet Republic would permit at any time any other Soviet Republic anywhere in the world to join the Russian Republic. In 1923, when the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics was formed, it was understood that if at any time there should be a Polish Soviet Republic, a Ger-

man, or a French Republic they, likewise could join just as have the seve republics which today make up the U. S. S. R.

I think the Five-Year Plan is not a definite punctuation point in the hi tory of Russia. What will happen after this Five-Year Plan will be a other Five-Year Plan. The Communists themselves speak in terms of Fifteen-Year Plan and they are counting on having the standard of livin in Russia higher not by 1933, but by 1943; and they themselves feel part of their policy in the Communist party, part of the pledge they mak to their own proletariat is that some day other countries will join in an eventually form a Union of Socialist Soviet Republics of the World, wit its capital at Moscow.

QUESTION: *I would like to ask Mr. Hindus what place the doctor an individual interested in scientific research hold in the present scheme c things?*

MR. HINDUS: May I suggest that Mr. White answer the question? H has been living in Moscow a great deal where he was in close contact wit physicians and scientific people, and I was wandering around in the village

In the villages the condition of the physician is very pathetic, as is th condition of the school teacher, but there are no scientific people to amou to anything in the villages. I really think Mr. White could give a mo competent answer to that question than I.

MR. WHITE: Here as in so many things in Soviet Russia, enters th problem of class. When the proletariat and Communist party took ov Russia, they inherited an intelligentsia which included the doctor and scie tific man who were not of proletarian origin and probably not in sympath with communism. This whole group, however, felt that the only thin to do was to go on working. If you had to face the problem of losin your job or keeping your mouth shut, you would keep your mouth shut.

There is in Russia today, the great group of intelligentsia outside th party but working for salary, and following to the best of their honest in tentions, their own scientific ambitions.

I know intimately the story of a number of doctors. I know bette perhaps, the story of university professors. The doctor as a rule is no political. It is very hard to be anti-Soviet in cancer operations. Th doctor, as a rule, works a number of hours per day in a state hospital, fo which he gets a salary. At the same time he runs a private practice. Th Russian doctors do not call on their patients as they do here. Docto earn—if you want to judge it by a money yardstick, two, three, four, c five hundred dollars a month. They live very comfortably.

University professors, so long as what they are teaching is not political (it is very hard to be political as far as Newton's Laws of Gravity are concerned) live in two or three rooms and get a salary from the university and teach your subject. What they do know, however, is that some day the proletarian government hopes it will be able to build out of its own class, new doctors, new intelligentsia and these will be more loyal, more potentially pro-Soviet than the present group.

THE CHAIRMAN: I promised Mr. Raffalovich I would let him ask one more question in less than a minute because Mr. Hindus can have only a minute and a half to answer.

QUESTION: *As collectivization or passing into the hands of collectivity means overproduction, industrial and agricultural, and is the basic element of Socialist philosophy and especially of Communist philosophy, then, what is the difference between that and state capitalism otherwise than the new labor of the usual hallmark made in Moscow.*

MR. HINDUS: I am neither a metaphysician nor philosopher and therefore I am not competent to discuss the various metaphysical aspects of the Russian régime or the theories underlying that régime. All I will say again is that in theory, according to Lenin, who has written more about communism than anybody else, under communism the State disappears completely—there is no State. In Russia, the State is everything, and I submit that there is quite a distinction between a system of society when there is no State and a system of society when you can hardly get your bread unless you have the permission of the State.

The meeting adjourned at three-thirty o'clock.

Chamberlin, W. H. *Soviet Russia.* Boston, Little Brown, 1930.

The Moscow correspondent of "The Christian Science Monitor" gives a comprehensive account of the social and economic transformations effected in Russia by the Soviet government.

Counts, George S. *A Ford Crosses Soviet Russia.* Boston, The Stratford Company, 1930.

This record of a unique journey shows insight into both the achievements and difficulties of the Soviet economic system.

Dean, Vera M. *The United States and Russia,* Parts I and II. F. P. A. Information Service, February 20 and March 6, 1929.

Russia's Agrarian Problem. F.P.A. Information Service, July 23, 1930.

Foreign Trade Policy of the Soviet Government. F. P. A. Information Service, December 10, 1930.

The Economist (London) "Russian Supplement," November 1, 1930.

Eddy, Sherwood. *The Challenge of Russia.* New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1931.

Mr. Eddy believes that neither capitalism nor communism furnishes a universal panacea. The United States, however, must set its own house in order, by means of social and economic reforms, if it is to meet the challenge of Soviet Russia.

Feiler, Arthur. *The Russian Experiment.* New York, Harcourt Brace, 1931.

An editor of the "Frankfurter Zeitung" gives a sound and illuminating interpretation of Soviet policies and achievements.

Fischer, Louis. *The Soviets in World Affairs.* New York, Cape and Smith, 1930 (two volumes).

The Moscow correspondent of "The Nation," who had unrivaled opportunities for research in Soviet archives, sets down a valuable record of international events as the Soviets see them.

Grinko, G. T. *The Five-Year Plan of the Soviet Union.* New York, International Publishers, 1930.

The Vice-Chairman of the Soviet State Planning Commission gives a comprehensive account of the industrial and agricultural programs of the Five-Year Plan, and of the results attained during the first two years of its operation.

Harper, Samuel N. *Civic Training in Soviet Russia.* Chicago University Press, 1929.

A timely study of the Soviet government's efforts to promote and direct civic activity. The author, who is a well-informed student of Russian affairs, reaches the conclusion that the Soviet government utilizes political, economic and ethnic interests for the purpose of stimulating class consciousness on the part of the citizens.

Hindus, Maurice. *Humanity Uprooted.* New York, Cape and Smith, 1929.

The author sketches in fluent style the social institutions of Soviet Russia, and indicates the attitude adopted toward them by peasant and proletarian.

Broken Earth. New York, Cape and Smith, 1926.

Hoover, Calvin B. *Economic Life of Soviet Russia.* New York, Macmillan, 1931.

Mr. Hoover is of the opinion that, while the Soviet economic system compares favorably with capitalism in some important respects and may eventually prove a menace to the existing order, it has not yet demonstrated its ability to provide "the good life" even for the ruling minority of the proletariat.

Knickerbocker, H. R. *The Red Trade Menace.* New York, Dodd Mead and Company, 1931.

The able articles on Soviet production and foreign trade recently contributed to the "New York Evening Post" by its Berlin correspondent are here reprinted in book form.

Pinkevitch, Albert P. *The New Education in Soviet Russia.* New York, John Day, 1929.

A study of the theory which underlies the work of Soviet pedagogues, and of the methods employed by them to prepare workers and peasants for the tasks of a Communist State.

Vernadsky, George. *A History of Russia.* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930 (second edition).

The most comprehensive and up-to-date English textbook on the subject.

White, William C. *These Russians.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931.

The activities, hopes and fears of seventeen types of ordinary folk revealed through conversation. These vivid pen pictures give an intimate view of life in Soviet Russia.